



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/076,181	02/12/2002	Hal Hildebrand	2222.5390002	8962

26111 7590 05/17/2007  
STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.  
1100 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.  
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER

BATES, KEVIN T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2155

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

05/17/2007

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/076,181

Applicant(s)

HILDEBRAND ET AL.

Examiner

Kevin Bates

Art Unit

2155

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 April 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 10-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 10-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f):
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

***Response to Amendment***

This Office Action is in response to a communication made on April 20, 2007.

Claims 1-9 have been cancelled.

Claims 22-28 have been newly added.

Claims 10 – 28 are pending in this application.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

**Claims 10-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Misra (5757920) in view of Rai (6421714).**

**Regarding claims 10, 18 and 21,** Misra teaches a method for providing access management through use of a plurality of server machines associated with different locations (Column 4, lines 31 – 39), said method comprising the acts of:

(a) authenticating a user with a first server machine of the plurality of server machines with respect to a prior access request;

(b) subsequently receiving a current access request to access a secured item via a second server machine of the plurality of server machines;

(c) reconfiguring the first server machine to prevent further access by the user to secured items via the first server machine (Column 7, lines 53 – 65); and

(d) reconfiguring the second server machine to permit access by the user to at least the secured item via the second server machine (Column 5, lines 10 – 21, wherein the first server machine is the home domain, and the second machine is a different domain).

Misra does not explicitly indicate that if a request from the user is received at a second location, then it performs the reconfiguring step of the first machine and second machine.

Rai teaches a system of a mobile user where if the user leaves the access point of a first server and enters the access of a second server (Column 6, lines 38 – 51), the user start issuing commands to the new server and the system reconfigures the second server to handle the user requests (Column 8, lines 36 – 44) and deletes the user's access to the first server (Column 8, lines 42-44).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Rai's teaching of handing-off user access to Misra's teaching in order to support Misra's secure login to the network, while allowing that security to be passed to a new access point without having to re-authenticate the user.

**Regarding claims 11, 22, and 25**, Misra teaches a method as recited in claims 10, 18, and 21, wherein said authenticating (a) authenticates both the user and a client machine being used by the user (Column 4, line 66 – Column 5, line 9).

**Regarding claims 12 and 26**, Misra teaches a method as recited in claims 10 and 21, wherein the first server machine and the second server machine are access points for the user to gain access to secured items (Column 5, lines 10 – 14).

**Regarding claims 13 and 23**, Misra teaches a method as recited in claims 10 and 18, wherein when the user is at a first location, the user interacts over a network with the first server machine using a first client machine at the first location, and wherein when the user is at a second location, the user interacts over a network with the second server machine using a second client machine at the second location (Column 5, lines 10 – 21).

**Regarding claims 14, 20, and 27**, Misra teaches a method as recited in claims 13, 18, and 21, wherein said method further comprises at least the acts of: (f) determining, prior to said reconfiguring (c) or (d), whether the user is permitted to gain access from a second location to secured items via the second server machine (Column 5, lines 10 – 16).

**Regarding claim 15**, Misra teaches a method as recited in claim 13, wherein said authenticating (a) of the user occurs while the user is at a first location, and wherein said receiving (a) of the access request to access the secured item from the user occurs while the user is at a second location (Column 5, lines 10 – 21, wherein the system has a home location with maintains the credentials and authorization, which is then distributed through the server system).

**Regarding claims 16, 24, and 28**, Misra teaches a method as recited in claims 16, 18, and 21, wherein said method further comprises at least the acts of: (e)

determining permitted locations from which the user is permitted to gain access to secured documents; (f) determining, prior to said reconfiguring (c) or (d), whether the second location is one of the permitted locations for the user; and (g) bypassing said reconfiguring (c) or (d) when said determining (f) determines that the second location is not one of the permitted locations for the user (Column 5, lines 10 – 21).

**Regarding claims 17 and 19**, Misra teaches a method as recited in claims 16 and 18, wherein when the user is at the first location, the user interacts over a network with the first server machine using a first client machine at the first location, and wherein when the user is at the second location, the user interacts over a network with the second server machine using a second client machine at the second location (Column 3, line 67 – Column 4, line 7; Column 4, line 66 – Column 5, line 2; Column 5, lines 10 – 19, wherein the user and machine locations are roaming in the system and which ever domain the user/machine combination logs in at it connects to that domains controller which is the same location as the machine location).

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 10-28 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### ***Prior Art***

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

U. S. Patent No. 6058424 issued to Dixon, because it teaches passing a user session from a first server to a second server.

U. S. Patent No. 7188181 issued to Squier, because it teaches a system where a first server receives a request for secure content a second server and passes the security information onto the second server.

**Conclusion**

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kevin Bates whose telephone number is (571) 272-3980. The examiner can normally be reached on 9 am - 5 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Saleh Najjar can be reached on (571) 272-4006. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

JB TBT  
KB  
May 10, 2007

  
SALEH NAJJAR  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER